

## **COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS**

**February 7, 2006**

**6:15 PM**

The Clerk called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: School Committee Members Herbert, Gelinas, Beaudry and  
Aldermen Roy and Forest

Absent: Alderman Thibault

Deputy City Clerk Johnson advised that nominations are in order to elect a Chair of the Committee.

Alderman Forest moved to nominate School Committee Member Arthur Beaudry as Chairman.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman Forest it was voted to close nominations.

Chairman Beaudry stated thank you to my colleagues for their vote. I appreciate that this evening. Hopefully we can all work together collectively for the better good of the City of Manchester and our constituents.

Chairman Beaudry stated the first purpose of the meeting is organizational in nature, and requests the Clerk to provide a brief overview regarding typical issues addressed by the Committee.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated I would advise that this Committee is actually statutory in nature. For those of you who have not had any experience in it it is known as the Joint Building Committee under statute and the statute provides that you would have oversight of the construction of school facilities in the City of Manchester in this instance. You have a duty to oversee and decide all matters relating to the construction of school houses and submit monthly status reports relating to the construction progress, prepare and submit financial reports relating to total authorized construction budget and expenditures, anything that is appropriated by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen is administered by this Committee in terms of construction and schools. They cannot be erected or otherwise altered without coming to this Committee. So it is a big job that you have and I wish you luck at it over the next term.

Chairman Beaudry addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Update on the School Facilities Improvement Project.

Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager, asked am I to understand there was some confusion with the agendas. Do you guys have agendas?

Chairman Beaudry answered yes we do.

Mr. Clougherty stated Alan Jefferson with DMJM is going to run us through some of the progress that we have made over the past 60 days.

Alan Jefferson, DMJM, stated in the past 60 days at Central High School the quad gate installation is ongoing and the war memorial construction is actually completed and the punchlist is ongoing at that facility. At West High School the punchlist is ongoing and nearing completion. Restroom upgrades have been completed and the fin tube radiation replacement is nearly complete. VCT floor installation took place over the Christmas break. At Memorial High School the new boiler installation is nearly complete. The interior painting is ongoing and punchlisting is also ongoing at that facility. At Hillside and Southside final MEP is nearly complete at both schools and punchlisting is also ongoing. Primarily at the elementary school level mechanical, electrical and plumbing work is ongoing primarily at Bakersville, Wilson and Beech. The majority of the other elementary schools are at various stages of punchlisting at this time.

Mr. Clougherty stated so overall our project right now is about 90% complete. Some big things that we are going to be looking at over the next 30-60 days would obviously be close out of the high schools. There are some issues that we are dealing with with Gilbane at those high schools. We will be trying to get those closed out. A lot of the activity is wrap up activity. A couple of major items we are going to be doing over the summer break would be installation of the new roof at Green Acres and wrapping up the roofs that were installed at the 10 or 11 other schools. At this point in time no real huge major activities. We are not going to be opening up any new parking garages or additions or things like that. Gilbane's schedule is a little bit more aggressive than what was originally proposed and we are anticipating full completion of the project around August 2006. Any questions?

Alderman Forest stated I see a little notation here about Northwest Elementary. Seeing that I am new on this Committee and if it is something that is going to take too long let me know but what did you do at Northwest? I know you did some repairs there. Is that going to take that long? I see a cringe on Alan's face.

Mr. Clougherty responded I can give you the nickel tour. At Northwest we primarily did flooring replacements on the interior replacing some carpet with VCT and replacing some carpet in other areas. Obviously one of the schools where there was less work than others because of its age. It was built in 1985. A big part of the work over there had to do with replacement of the roof as well as installation of what is referred to as through wall flashing in the brick, which was a pretty big project. That was the source of the leaks along the gymnasium that have been plaguing that school for a number of years. We are still working out some bugs with a roof leak that we have in that area but we are confident that we will be able to find that and button that up.

Alderman Forest stated I just want to apologize. I should have called you to prepare you for this.

Mr. Clougherty responded not a big deal.

Alderman Roy stated Tim as we go through the close-out and punchlisting of the different properties that Gilbane has worked on and it seems like Gilbane is getting selective on whether or not they would like to come to these meetings, could we start getting copies of the punchlists or whatever forms you use in the process of close out so we can kind of monitor some of the things that have been done, some of the problems you are having with Gilbane and just get an idea of how they are going through the close outs. Is that feasible?

Mr. Clougherty responded it is definitely feasible. It is rather cumbersome administratively. When we talk about like Central High School our punchlist started out at 70 pages and pretty soon we are going to have 21 schools on punchlists. Even if we say that Central High School is a real big school and every other one is 15 pages, that is still 300 pages worth of information. I am not sure how to efficiently address what you are looking at. If it helps at all as part of the close out process what we have worked with School Administration to foster and will be following is a process where when we understand that our punchlist is complete from a...you know have we punchlisted everything standpoint we then send it over to School Administration as well as the school principal. We allow them time to review it and then we set up a meeting where we go over to their school and we review what the punchlist items are and it allows them the opportunity to bring up other items that we may have overlooked or in their perception we have overlooked as it relates to punchlists. I think that is really closing the loop on the school side. Off the top of my head I can't think of an easy way to answer that request.

Alderman Roy stated the reason I am asking just to give you an idea is as we go through the schools that are being closed out I want to see if there are any trends

that...you know if flooring like it was at Central has been an issue in seven of twenty-one of the schools or what we have to look forward to because as we close out this project we will be closing out the contingency as well or applying that to other projects so I don't want to shortchange ourselves by spending too rapidly. I would rather go ahead and know exactly what is going on with the punchlists and what trends there are out there. If you could figure out a way to do it electronically or a way that is administratively feasible that would help.

Mr. Clougherty responded the items that I would be primarily concerned with if you are looking at it from a fiscal perspective relative to contingency are the items that the City has dispute with Gilbane on. Say it is a flooring issue, for example. We may have a punchlist items that says you have chipped tile in A, B and C classrooms and Gilbane says yes that is not a problem we are going to take care of it but we say you have separating tile in 1, 2, 3 classrooms and we have gotten acknowledgement from Gilbane that they don't feel it is part of their scope of work. In the first case, financially we are protected with retainage and other means. In the second case we would either be looking at retainage if we felt that our case was strong enough to force Gilbane to do that or we would be looking at outside sources and the contingency would be an outside source. I think it is really those disputed items that we would want to key in on. Allow us the next month to think about how we can best inform the Committee of how we stand relative to those types of items.

Alderman Roy stated Tim as usual we think quite a bit alike because I was going to go to disputed items next. Is there a listing or is there anything you can provide to us before the next meeting that has what the disputed items are and to what magnitude they are disputed? Are we talking about one floor in one classroom or are we talking about floors throughout buildings? I would like to be able to wrap my hands around the scope of what you are disputing with Gilbane. If they are not here to answer questions we would like to have that information and then possibly lend some weight to your decisions or be able to guide you from our perspective as to what is going on.

Mr. Clougherty responded I would be more than happy to provide you with that list. I am not sure exactly what form we have it in but I can get that information to you. I would caution against debating the merits of those issues in a forum such as this, however. If it is for an informational perspective and you want to understand fiscally where we stand that is wise but I don't think it is wise for us to debate the merits of the issue in this forum.

Alderman Roy stated I would agree. Where is the total retainage held? Is that accurate – the \$4,923,702?

Mr. Clougherty responded that sounds about right.

Alderman Roy asked and is Gilbane the only contractor or subcontractor that we held any retainage from. They were our sole contractor?

Mr. Clougherty answered yes.

School Committee Member Herbert stated my understanding is that some of that retainage is actually being held from subcontractors. In other words they turn around and hold subcontractor's money. If, for instance, there is something with Gilbane that we don't like about a certain portion of the job like flooring or windows do the subcontractors also have their feet to the fire? How do we...I thought that there would be retainage and part of that retainage would be held by Gilbane? I thought it was a tool for everybody, not just Gilbane.

Mr. Clougherty replied your recollection and assumption is correct. Although the City isn't privy or party to the agreements that Gilbane holds with its subcontractors, standard industry practice is that the general contractor or construction manager withholds money from the actual trade doing the work as retainage usually in direct proportion and it is released in the same fashion or contractual terms as represented in his agreement with the City. In other words, Gilbane will pass on the terms and conditions represented in its contract with the City to its subcontractors. So the money that Gilbane is retaining, in this case the \$4.9 million, one may assume that he vast majority of that is actually being retained from other contractors as well. Our contract is solely with Gilbane and that is really all that we care about.

Chairman Beaudry stated I have a few questions. As far as the program manager, is that DMJM?

Mr. Clougherty answered yes it is.

Chairman Beaudry stated under the work covered by contract documents that you gave me with the CD it says that the development, implementation and monitoring of expedient procedures for submittals, change orders, information requests, payments and approvals go through them. My question is going back to Central High School with the flooring where the plywood, the A grade was substituted with B grade. How did that end up happening when throughout this document it says that the project manager is supposed to look at the manifest to make sure that the product is compliant with the work that is supposed to be done and also if there is a change order or any change in work product they are supposed to go back and report to the owner, which I assume would be yourself representing the City to concur with the change? I have to get it clear how did that flooring get put down

without that being somehow caught if they are supposed to report in writing, the contractor, of any changes in product? Again, it states that the program manager is supposed to be checking the product as it comes in to make sure it complies with the work. With all of that being said, how could that have been missed?

Mr. Jefferson stated we were contracted to basically do quality assurance. It is not quality control. Quality control and the responsibility for what is installed in the field is the sole responsibility of Gilbane. It is in their contract and in their quality control plan. We are here to make sure that they adhere to their plan. Also, if there are issues such as this that do come up what we do is provide all of the back-up documentation that was submitted to us by the contractor of the City so this type of issue can be worked out. To check every single nail that is pounded, we can't do that. It is not our job.

Chairman Beaudry stated well the project is pretty much almost done but what safeguard could we have put in place so this wouldn't have occurred.

Mr. Jefferson responded well there is initial...I can't remember exactly what Gilbane's quality control plan was but I believe their initial product and delivery check...I apologize but I don't have it in front of me but it is supposed to be checked by the contractor or the construction manager on the site to insure that what arrives on the site is correct. Are some things caught by the subcontractor? Yes. Are some things caught by DMJM? Yes.

Chairman Beaudry stated the encapsulation of the floor at Central, you had stated earlier that it was saving roughly \$60,000 because to remove the asbestos was \$150,000 and to encapsulate it was going to cost us roughly \$90,000. Where would we see that in the line items, that savings? Where would we recognize that?

Mr. Clougherty responded off the top of my head I don't recall what the exact documents are that recognize that savings but I can provide those to you at the next meeting.

Chairman Beaudry replied if you would please. One further thing, I noticed some change orders as far as conduit. It went from 3/4" conduit to 1/2" conduit but the cost...there was no cost difference which kind of surprises me and that was just one that I could pick out. Why wouldn't there be a cost difference if you are changing from 3/4" to 1/2" in conduit? I know in retail if you go to the store there is a difference but would there be no difference in the wholesale market?

Mr. Clougherty stated the change order that you are referring to I don't remember what the aggregate of the change order was. There were several instances such as you are referring to where we allowed Gilbane to change materials, where we felt

that the material that they were proposing would serve the purpose as good as the material that was specified and there are other instances where they proposed these types of situations and the City asked for other things in return for that – just compensation if you will. I don't know, again, what the aggregate of the change order was that you are referring to. I am familiar with it because it was an item of much debate but then the decision was made within our office that the requisite for the ¾" conduit across the board was rather stringent and Gilbane's argument that it wasn't an industry standard had some merit to it. We felt that allowing them to run ½" conduit down the wall to outlet boxes, which is all that we allowed, served the best interest of the City and the School District because you have smaller conduit running down the wall. We still required that the feeder conduit remain at the ¾" size so if we had to snake more wires into them in the future we would be able to do that.

School Committee Member Herbert stated going back to the underlay floor material...I think you explained this once before but if you could just go over it again what is the difference between the two grades and also it is almost a follow on issue in terms of what Chairman Beaudry was asking earlier about the savings. I am assuming the lower grade cost less so I am wondering is there any way to identify the savings or estimate what the savings might have been. The first question is is there a qualitative difference in terms of the use of that board under the floor?

Mr. Clougherty responded there is a qualitative difference from what we can see. AC grade versus BC grade. The grade that was used to my recollection was applicable to the application. In other words, it was suitable for the application but a lower grade than what was specified. Let's make the assumption that we specified AC grade and they supplied BC grade. Now according to the APA, which is the authority...well not really the authority having jurisdiction but it is an industry wide acceptable standard. According to them the BC grade is fine for underlayment. So then we get to the question what is the cost difference. We ran some quick numbers. Across the entire building at the Classical Arts Building I think the difference would have been somewhere around \$3,000.

School Committee Member Herbert replied so considering the square footage, not a huge difference.

Mr. Clougherty responded no not at all.

School Committee Member Herbert stated the other question is when we were talking about pricing when you do your original RFP and this was a large RFP and it was signed and bid on and delivered three or four years ago right.

Mr. Clougherty responded it was April 2003.

School Committee Herbert asked what is the flexibility in terms of price changes. I have to assume that a lot of these are quasi prices that will change over time. Are there parts of the RFP that allow for pricing adjustment...I mean wood can be pretty volatile I think at times. What if Gilbane estimated a cost of so much per square foot and by the time they actually had to buy a large chunk of it it was +5%. Is there a method in which Gilbane can recoup or is it just like playing "Gotcha" or does that never happen? I was just wondering. There were a lot of materials purchased. Steel I remember was pretty volatile for awhile.

Mr. Clougherty answered those types of things happen all the time. Fortunately our contract was structured so that material escalation or recoupment of material escalation was not a provision that Gilbane could take advantage of. Given that, according to Gilbane probably 10 months into the project they were taking a pretty substantial hit because of the escalation in steel costs. As you mentioned, wood is a commodity and I know for a fact that wood has gone up substantially in the last three years just from building a house myself. So those things are taken into consideration when we are negotiating change orders or changes in scope or changes in product or things like that. I am not saying that those were a factor in this particular case but it is certainly a factor to consider.

School Committee Member Herbert stated my underlying point and I guess I will make it now is without an adjustment mechanism, either informal or formal, I don't think it would behoove the taxpayer or the school kids to have a contractor going under water because of that kind of thing. We have had a lot of changes in material pricing and common sense would tell you that that is a lot of pressure to put on a contractor. It opens the door for a lot of things we wouldn't like. I think common sense tells you if rubber goes up 10% between two Fridays...I know I change my price so somebody is of the mind to say well you know this is what you told me you were going to do. It becomes an unreasonable expectation because it is something beyond anyone's control, i.e. commodity pricing. That puts pressure somewhere and more than likely it comes out in the quality. That is a cautionary note I am making but it is a long contract. Whether it is informal or formal I just...keep that in mind when you go over pricing contracts and changes. There are a lot of factors involved in that. Unless you are there and unless you are an expert in the field be careful about jumping to conclusions.

Chairman Beaudry addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Items submitted for consideration by Tim Clougherty, Chief Facilities Manager:



a) Hallsville roof structure design proposal;

Mr. Clougherty asked does the Committee have copies of these. I sent copies of the letters that were written to the Building & Sites Committee approving these. Hallsville roof structure. During January through March of this year the Facilities Division engaged with Foley, Buhl and Roberts to conduct a preliminary assessment of the structure of the roof at Hallsville Elementary School. There were some issues that came up during construction. Some concern was raised and the purpose of the study was to fully assess any potential issues, which may have arisen due to that new construction or the existing conditions at the school. Foley and Buhl found at that time that no eminent danger exists, however, there are some deficiencies that were caused by the widening of the school in early part of the 1900's and they recommended a full assessment and design to repair the situation. After consulting with the School District and the Administration we brought this forward to the Building & Sites Committee and it was subsequently approved and we are bringing it forward this evening at the request of that Committee for consideration of funding by the Joint School Building Committee.

Alderman Roy asked did they give you any idea of a price or would there be an RFP for this.

Mr. Clougherty answered I apologize that the price is not in there. I believe the price was somewhere around \$26,000.

Alderman Roy asked and that was strictly for design and not repair.

Mr. Clougherty answered that is correct.

Alderman Roy asked is there a copy of their report.

Mr. Clougherty answered I can make a copy of their report and have it distributed. Their report was rather technical to say the least but I would be happy to make sure that report was distributed to the members.

Alderman Roy asked if I could get a copy that would be greatly appreciated. According to your letter they recommended that a full assessment and design for repairs be conducted in the next 12-18 months. How long would it take for them to do their design or assessment?

Mr. Clougherty answered we are hoping to get their design done so that we can come back to this Committee or the Building & Sites Committee for funding consideration for those repairs during this summer.

Alderman Roy asked and with the 12-18 month design window that they gave you is this something that if not acted on in the next 18 months it would become a safety concern.

Mr. Clougherty answered I am not going to comment on that. I would rather allow them to do their full assessment before we jump to any conclusions one way or the other relative to that 18 months. They may come back and say you can wait until next summer or they may come back and say we need to do it right now.

Alderman Roy asked the assessment they have already done, the preliminary assessment, where did those funds come from.

Mr. Clougherty answered they came out of this project fund because of the problem coming up during the existing construction that was ongoing. I engaged their services independently in order to protect the interest of the City and get away from any potential impropriety with Gilbane's structural engineer – you know who caused the problem and who is going to pay for the problem and that type of thing. We engaged their services independently.

Alderman Roy asked and the cost of their initial assessment.

Mr. Clougherty answered why don't we go on to the next question. I will find that.

Chairman Beaudry asked Tim can you give a little background on how this was diagnosed. It had to do with the design-build project when they were putting the ductwork in I assume so that the Aldermen know how this came about.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes. There was...I don't know if everybody is familiar with this school and what happened to that school but back in 1908 or 1912 the school building was square. Architects at that time decided that it would be best to cut the building in half essentially and move one half of it westward in order to make the building larger. Now the building was a wood frame truss roof structure and there were some deficiencies that were created because of that. We cut some ductwork into some partitions. There were some concerns. We got this engineer involved. He came in and saw the deficiencies with the beams and said okay you guys did the ductwork all right but these beams aren't looking very good according to today's engineering practices so we need to take another look at it.

Chairman Beaudry stated we are lacking time so we have to move on.

Mr. Clougherty stated \$5,800 was the cost of the initial study.

Chairman Beaudry asked for the motion this evening would we put a dollar amount in.

Mr. Clougherty answered yes \$29,800.

Chairman Beaudry stated a motion would be in order to allow for a full assessment and design outline for \$29,800.

School Committee Member Herbert moved to authorize the expenditure of up to \$29,800 for the full assessment and roof structure design for Hallsville School. School Committee Member Gelinas duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy stated I know we are getting to a tight timeframe so I will make this brief. There has been talk about schools in that area and overcrowding. Are the School Board members comfortable that with this assessment and repairs that school is going to live as a schoolhouse for five, ten...are the three of you comfortable or the Building & Sites Committee comfortable that that will stay an elementary school.

Chairman Beaudry stated I don't believe it has been identified as a school we are going to get rid of.

Chairman Beaudry called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

b) Beech Street School fire alarm proposal

Mr. Clougherty stated once again this was brought before the Building & Sites Committee for approval, was subsequently approved and it was requested that we refer it to this Committee for funding consideration. During the execution of the design-build project at Beech Street it came to our attention that the fire alarm system did not fully meet code requirements regarding coverage. While complete replacement of the system is not necessary, we must upgrade the system itself. We have consulted with the Fire Department and we have had an upgraded system engineered, which will meet the needs of the location. We bid the project. Total cost would be \$106,780 and we are asking the Committee for that consideration. I just need to bring one other thing up. Since the time that we brought this to the Building & Sites Committee we have met with the low bid contractor. Because 60 days has passed since the bid was accepted, that contractor is looking for additional consideration of material escalation to the tune of about \$8,000. I don't believe that we can do that within the confines of our procurement code and I am going to follow-up with the City Solicitor on that but for purposes of this motion I

would like the Committee to consider a total cost of \$115,000 rather than the \$107,000.

Chairman Beaudry asked and that would take care of the fire alarm panel and the controller for the elevator.

Mr. Clougherty answered that is correct.

Alderman Forest moved to authorize the expenditure of \$115,000 for a fire alarm system at Beech Street School. Alderman Roy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Roy asked how many contractors came in on that RFP.

Mr. Clougherty answered there were at least three. I don't have the bid results with me.

Alderman Roy asked do you know roughly what the other two were looking at.

Mr. Clougherty answered they were pretty close. They weren't way out there but even being allowed the \$115,000 makes me a little bit anxious. I am actually not very confident that it is going to come in at that number. I think we are going to look at obviously rebidding it and trying to make some changes to the project to get it within those funds.

Alderman Roy stated I am going to vote for this but I would like to see a rebilled bid and the costs. Sixty days shouldn't have moved things \$8,000 or \$10,000 and now we are approving \$9,000 more but for the sake of moving this that is fine.

Chairman Beaudry responded I would concur with you, Alderman Roy. Hopefully they will look at that and try to keep the price down to the original price that was stated.

Chairman Beaudry called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

c) open concept classroom discussion.

Mr. Clougherty stated briefly we have received proposals from architecture and engineering firms to eliminate the open concept schools at five locations. The proposals are attractive. We will be reviewing them with School Administration, interviewing candidates and hiring someone to get moving on that so we can get something done for this summer.

Chairman Beaudry asked can you tell us the five schools if you have them.

Mr. Clougherty stated Parker-Varney, Highland Goffes Falls, Beech Street, Webster and Green Acres.

Chairman Beaudry stated under other business now that this project is winding down I would like to see the contingency funds as far as...right now anything above \$25,000 has to come before the Joint School Buildings Committee for a vote. I have looked through what we had already for change orders and roughly \$659,000 has been allocated for change orders that were under the \$25,000. With that being said I would like to lower that number to \$7,500 and entertain a motion that any change order exceeding \$7,500 shall be approve by the Joint School Buildings Committee unless time sensitive. The Joint School Buildings Committee will be notified at their next meeting of the change orders. If it is a time sensitive issue you can go ahead and do it but then you would notify us at our next joint meeting.

Alderman Forest stated I think I recall listening to a meeting, not that I remember all of it, but when they lowered the change order thing to \$25,000 and the question I would have for you Tim is it has been a long time since I have been involved in any kind of construction but how would that affect a contractor? \$25,000 is a lot of money to the average person when they are building a house or something but when you have a \$105 million project a \$25,000 change order if you have to wait a week or two or three could end up costing more money. How difficult would that be to implement with a project this big? I know we are winding down on the project.

Mr. Clougherty responded we are winding down and in all honesty this is the first I have heard of this. What I would ask is for you to allow us to go back and look at the list we have of outstanding change orders, see what the magnitude of those change orders is, see what the time sensitivity is of them and basically give us a month to come back before you make that motion just to allow us to assess that. I am not sure that it would really handcuff us at this point in time but I think it would be prudent to look at the potential for that.

Alderman Forest moved to table.

Chairman Beaudry stated I don't think we need to table this because there wasn't an official motion made. We can wait until next month and Tim can come back with information.

Mr. Clougherty stated I have the wording from the previous motion that was approved about three years ago and I can either modify it to meet your needs or I

can send it to you to make things easier for the Clerk and perhaps we could have it included in the agenda for distribution.

Alderman Roy stated a very final item. Tim, it has come to my attention that in many of our school buildings the electrical and boiler rooms are being used as storage rooms. I guess this would be a request of the Committee that we ask your department to go ahead and start enforcing and asking the principals of those schools to start enforcing the fire code as well as bringing a policy to us that we can approve next month that we can then give to the School Board for their concurrence to stop using those boiler and electrical rooms as storage rooms. The fire hazards in a boiler room are tremendous.

Alderman Roy moved to have Tim Clougherty draft a policy as stated above. Alderman Forest duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Beaudry called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Beaudry stated on quick thing. At Central High School again the parking garage and up top where the monuments are the puddling of water. I know you are working on it. We went over there the other day because there was a concern of the Safety Review Committee. We went when it was raining out and there was a huge puddle in the courtyard and downstairs there was water but it wasn't as bad as it was in the spring.

Mr. Clougherty responded I got a call from Mr. O'Neil of the Safety Committee. We are aware of both situations. There is also another one in the area that they call the quad in front of the gym that is a pretty large problem. The garage the other day we found the pumps had tripped a breaker and that is why there was some flooding in the garage. The area on top of the courtyard we are going to be looking at with Gilbane as well but a good part of that problem was because of an excess amount of water due to a clogged gutter on that side of the building. My staff has since corrected that problem and we are hoping to alleviate some of that flooding but there is still some concrete that needs to be looked at through the contractor.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Forest, duly seconded by Alderman Roy it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee